

Editorial

Getting involved in the Democratic Party

Tonight at 7:30 in Harris Hall, the Lane County Democratic Party will hold a hearing to discuss the planks of the platform it will adopt at its platform convention later this month.

That discussion, which will provide the foundation for the final platform, is completely open to anyone over 18 who is interested in the Democratic Party.

In comparison to the smoke-filled room image of politics, this meeting is very refreshing. Anyone interested in the party can go to tonight's meeting. And participating in discussions, they will be helping to write a plank of the platform. What could be easier than that?

Quite simply, this process is aimed at

involving the rank-and-file members, of the party in making decisions, rather than letting a party "boss" make them for them.

The participation open to the rank-and-file member of the party does not end tonight. When the platform convention takes place Jan. 28 and 29, any registered member of the Democratic Party will be able to voice his opinion of the final proposals for the platform.

And, if Lane County Democratic Party Chairman Jim Klonoski has his way, the participation won't end at the end of the month, either.

"We want someone who will push for implementation of his ideas, someone who will go to the meetings the 12th, the 28th and the 29th and then follow through on their

ideas. The process doesn't begin and end with the making of policy—it includes implementing it."

So, beginning tonight, interested persons have an exceptional opportunity to become involved directly in the workings of a political party. This opportunity is not available to members—or potential members—of political parties in some other states.

The opportunity makes it very easy for the newly-registered student voter who is interested in becoming an active part of the Democratic Party to get directly involved with politics.

If persons have the interest, they should not miss this opportunity for involvement.

Letters

Grade clarification

In response to a request by Shannon Davis for student feedback on GPA policy, I offer some. One point that concerns the committee and myself is how to treat the grade of "P" in any GPA computation. Considering the purpose behind P-NP option, it would be quite contradictory to penalize a student who obtained a P by figuring the P as a C in GPA computation. The P-NP option is an attempt at liberalized education by elimination of grade hassles for the student who truly wants to learn but may have been frightened off by course difficulty. Admittedly, many students will see the option as an easy means to credits. One could argue, for this reason, that P should be equivalent to C. It would not be fair, however, to jeopardize those others for taking a course P-NP by counting P's as C's.

I would propose that P's not be averaged in at all. Whoever is going to be interested in a GPA will most likely see the student's transcript also. Thus, no student is going to fool someone with a high GPA from easier courses. The transcript will reveal which courses were taken P-NP and also those which had to be taken with that option. This is another reason not to average P's as C's for some courses have a mandatory P-NP option.

Furthermore, I advocate abolition of the NP grade and replacing it with no-record. There would be nothing recorded on the transcript in the event of a student's failure to pass a course. With the present system, however, a NP would have to be averaged in as a zero.

Nicholas Korn
Junior Psychology

For tax

Supposedly a cigarette tax increase would be discriminatory. True. Think about yourself not being able to afford a sixty dollar tuition increase for next year, or the large number of retarded and mentally ill already being released from the state hospitals, or senior citizens not being able to afford the taxes on their homes. Now we are looking at real and tragic discrimination.

Budgets really can't be cut further at this time. Further cuts in almost every area will mean equal losses in federal matching funds. Oregon could just kiss this money good-bye. We have already fired state employees (during a depressed economy) and have scheduled the elimination of the equivalent of 62 full time faculty positions at this University (think about all the closed out sections at registration already).

Page 10

If you wish to bring our state to its fiscal knees to show how much we need tax reform (reform will be the no. 1 issue in the '72 state elections anyway), then you may be relieved to know that we will almost surely have such a crisis. The May referendum divorcing Oregon's income tax from that of the federal government faces a 95 per cent probability of failure. The possible disaster described in relation to the cigarette tax will occur after the May referendum. We can in no way tolerate such a disaster twice. I encourage (and will work myself) for meaningful tax reform, but I don't believe fiscal suicide is a rational approach.

Vote yes on January 18, this is the only chance we have to win.

Alton L. King
ASUO Administrative Assistant

Discrimination

Exploiting women used to be a man's job. Now women want their share of exploiting everybody. Swell! With both men and women exploiting men and women we'll have total equality—not to mention total exploitation. When in doubt, use the Hugh Morris technique on libbys: "A misplaced WAC needs a well placed whack!"

Orin R. Murray

C.O. jobs

Many young men with conscientious objector draft status have not been able to find alternative service work, due to the dearth of job openings in the state.

Several professors have taken advantage of this rather inexpensive and steady (at least two years) labor force by convincing a young man's draft board that he would be enhancing the well-being of the nation by working on campus.

If you are planning to hire someone in the near future, please contact the C.O. Work Opportunity Project at 345-4871. You will be doing yourself and some conscientious objector a favor.

Bruce Reichert
History Major

Amnesty

Amnesty: Forgetfulness; an overlooking. 2. An act of sovereign power granting oblivion, or a general pardon, for a past offense.

The question of "amnesty" promises to be an issue in the upcoming election. Unfortunately the amnesty most of the

candidates are talking about seems quite conditional. Representative McCloskey, for example, offers amnesty to the exile in Canada and Sweden in "exchange" for several years of service to this nation. It looks as though Mr. McCloskey (and the candidates proposing similar conditional amnesty plans) feels a need to punish the men in Canada, before he will let them come back. I think this makes his proposal inadequate, and very probably doomed to failure.

To enact a pardon for a past offense, there must be a past offense. That is, unless a person commits a crime, he cannot, at some future date, be forgiven for his action.

The "crime" the current amnesty seeks to "forgive" is that of refusal to participate in the Vietnam War. Either a young man refused to go into the military service or he refused to stay within that service. Vietnam was the crux of the matter in either case.

I doubt that Vietnam will go down in history as one of our more meritorious wars. Indeed the Pentagon Papers suggest it will be remembered as a serious mistake at the least and possibly planned aggression at the worst.

This being the case, I find it hard to think in terms of a "conditional" amnesty. Conditional amnesty says to the exile: "Come back, admit that you made a mistake and are willing to put in two years of penance to pay for your crime, and then we will forgive you."

What kind of nonsense is this? His crime? I, for one, do not think that the men in Canada committed any crimes by refusing to participate in the current war effort. Furthermore, I think a young man in exile from his homeland has already suffered rather severe punishment. He's put in his time. And he knows it. What is more, he isn't going to humbly return and say "Yes, I was wrong. Let me serve this glorious land for two years now that it has forgiven me." The exile doesn't want a conditional pardon for an action he still believes was correct. And he damn well isn't going to accept it when he sees most of this country now opposing the war that he opposed quite a bit earlier.

Yes, amnesty should be given. We can benefit a great deal by bringing back the current exiles and affecting a national reconciliation. But to do this we must toss out the window any ideas that they must be punished for the "crimes" they committed. And until we do this all our talk of amnesty is just that. Talk.

David H. Morrissey
Political Science

